

Notice of Allowability	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/827,919		OHMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Daniel R. Sellers		2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 6/26/06.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 2,4,6,7,11,13,15,16 and 20.
3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
 5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
|--|--|

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. **Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 11, 13, 15-16, and 20** are allowed.
2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 2 recites two main limitations of "a detection unit" and an "erasure module" in the control unit "for erasing information stored in said storage medium according to the detection that a passenger has gotten off a vehicle". As applied above, Treyz is the closest prior art made of record herein. Treyz discloses the use of passenger sensors that detect when a user is in a vehicle (col. 40, lines 14-42). Thus, with regards to any such chronological indication, these sensors and the indication they provide read on a passenger sensor or "a detection unit". The nature of the utilized memories, such as the hard disk and RAM, as well as the "moving" of audio files (as compared with 'copying') mentioned in Treyz teach or at least infer the presence of an erasure module (col. 13, lines 42-44; col. 79, lines 11-24). However, Treyz nor any of the other prior art of record, teach or suggest such an "erasure module for erasing information stored in said storage medium according to the detection by said detection unit that a passenger of said vehicle has gotten off the vehicle". As such, Claim 2 is hereby indicated as allowable.

Claim 6 is allowable due to its dependency on allowable claim, claim 2.

Claim 4 recites two main limitations of "an detection unit for detecting ignition OFF of said vehicle" and an "erasure module" in the control unit "for erasing information

Art Unit: 2615

stored in said storage medium according to the detection by said detection unit of ignition OFF of said vehicle". As applied above, Treyz is the closest prior art made of record herein. Treyz discloses the use of passenger sensors that detect when a user is in a vehicle, one of which is an ignition sensor (col. 40, lines 14-42). Thus, this sensors "a detection unit for detecting ignition OFF of said vehicle". The nature of the utilized memories, such as the hard disk and RAM, as well as the "moving" of audio files (as compared with 'copying') mentioned in Treyz teach or at least infer the presence of an erasure module (col. 13, lines 42- 44; col. 79, lines 11-24). However, neither Treyz nor any of the other prior art of record, teach or suggest such an "erasure module for erasing information stored in said storage medium according to the detection by said detection unit of ignition OFF of said vehicle". As such, Claim 4 is hereby indicated as allowable.

Claim 7 recites two main limitations of "a checking module" and an "erasure module" in the control unit for, "when the erasure is not confirmed by said checking module, erases information stored in said storage medium again". As applied above, Treyz is the closest prior art made of record herein. As also detailed above, the nature of the utilized memories, such as the hard disk and RAM, as well as the "moving" of audio files (as compared with 'copying') mentioned in Treyz teach or at least imply the presence of an erasure module or code/circuitry for deleting files (col. 13, lines 42-44; col. 79, lines 11-24). Razavi also discloses the deletion of information concerning a particular network device. However, Treyz nor any of the other prior art of record, teach or suggest such a "checking module for checking whether information stored in said

Art Unit: 2615

storage medium has been erased by said erasure module or not" or "erasure module, when the erasure is not confirmed by said checking module, erases information stored in said storage medium again". Such a function of the erasure module is considered a functional limitation, in that the "for" imparts structural limitations on the erasure module that meet the requirements of the 'when' clause in the above limitations. As such, Claim 7 is hereby indicated as allowable.

Claim 11 is allowable for the same reasons as indicated above for claim 1.

Claim 13 is allowable for the same reasons as indicated above for claim 4.

Claim 15 is allowable due to its dependency on allowable claim 11.

Claim 16 is allowable for the same reasons as indicated above for claim 7.

Claim 20 recites a limitations of "a re-erasing step of checking whether said contents information stored in said storage medium has been erased or not in said erasing step and re-erasing said contents information if the erasure is not confirmed". As applied above, Treyz is the closest prior art made of record herein. As also detailed above, the nature of the utilized memories, such as the hard disk and RAM, as well as the "moving" of audio files (as compared with 'copying') mentioned in Treyz teach or at least imply the presence of an erasure module or code/circuitry for deleting files (col. 13, lines 42-44; col. 79, lines 11-24). Razavi also discloses the deletion of information concerning a particular network device. However, Treyz nor any of the other prior art of record, teach or suggest such a "a re-erasing step for checking whether information stored in said storage medium has been erased or not in said erasing step" and "re-

Art Unit: 2615

erasing said contents information if the erasure is not confirmed". As such, Claim 20 is hereby indicated as allowable.

Newly cited art does not teach or suggest the features which make claims 2, 4, 6-7, 11, 13, 15-16, and 20 allowable. Enoki et al., USPN 4,424,574, teaches erasing memory, such as random access memory, when the power supplied to a device is turned off (col. 1, lines 17-25), and in fact teaches away from this problem (col. 1, lines 25-29 and lines 41-46). Enoki et al. does not suggest that memory should be erased. Likewise, Yih et al., USPN 5,831,906, teaches a similar concept to Enoki et al. (col. 1, lines 13-16). Enoki et al. and Yih et al., in fact, teach a well-known concept in electrical devices containing random access memory and do not teach or suggest erasing memory when a passenger gets off a vehicle or when an ignition switch is turned off. Dayan et al., USPN 5,970,227, teaches the erasure of memory of a portable device when a portable device is removed from a location (col. 13, lines 45-64). Dayan et al. is concerned with sensitive data, which should not be allowed outside of a security perimeter (abstract). In any event, Dayan et al. does not teach or suggest erasing the storage device of a mounted audio device in a vehicle.



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER